AN

APPENDIX

TO A

LETTER to DR. SHEBBEARE.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED;

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON A PAMPHLET, ENTITLED, TAXATION NO TYRANNY:

IN WHICH THE SOPHISTRY OF THAT AUTHOR'S REASONING IS DETECTED.

BY A DOCTOR OF LAWS.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. DONALDSON, CORNER OF ARUNDEL STREET, IN THE STRAND.

MDCCLXXV.

SIR,

I Hope you'll forgive me for prefixing an Appendix to my Letter to you, containing ſome obſervations I have made on a pamphlet called *Taxation no Tyranny*, both on account of the connection between the ſubject of your letter and that pamphlet, and likewiſe becauſe I wanted to add ſome few things to my letter to you.

As you profeſs yourſelf a lover and defender of the Revolution, in your late pamphlet, to which I wrote an Anſwer, I now ſubmit to your conſideration, whether, upon theſe principles, the four kings preceding the Revolution, of the *Stewart* family, were to blame to the *Preſbyterians* and other *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, or they to thoſe kings? You agree with me, by that pamphlet of yours, that all government ariſes from

the people, and that they have a right, in the laſt reſort, to rectify abuſes in government; and indeed Mr. *Lock* and *Algernoon Sydney*, have made this ſo clear, to any man who will allow fair play to his underſtanding, that no mathematical propoſition by Sir *Iſaac Newton* is made clearer. Let us then examine by this principle, the conduct of theſe four princes to the *Preſbyterians* and *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, and their conduct towards theſe princes.

King *James* I. ſupported that idle dream, that princes were not only independent of their people, and accountable only to God, but likewiſe that they were kind of Gods themſelves, as may appear by ſeveral of his ſpeeches in parliament: and becauſe the *Preſbyterians* and other *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, would not renounce their common ſenſe, by flattering him in this idle conceit, he declared himſelf their enemy; and, as you obſerve in your pamplet, recommended this enmity to his ſon *Charles* I. and along with it, the ſame notions he himſelf had, of the abſolute power of kings over the lives and properties of their ſubjects. This king put theſe principles in practice, by raiſing taxes without conſent of parliament

parliament, and by not calling parliaments for many years; and the people were obliged, either to defend their liberties by force of arms, or to ſubmit to being his ſlaves. The *Preſbyterians* joined with the reſt of the people of *England*, to maintain their liberties, and the *Preſbyterians* in *Scotland* joined them: but after they had conquered theſe armies, by which the king had a mind to enſlave them, as they intended no more but to redreſs grievances, and to keep the regal authority within due bounds, ſo they oppoſed *Oliver Cromwell* in his intentions to behead the king, and to promote himſelf: and he was obliged to purge the parliament of *Preſbyterians*, before he could execute his intentions.

At the ſame time, theſe very *Preſbyterians* in *Scotland*, who fought in defence of the liberties of the nation, ſent an Army of 20,000 men under the *Duke of Hamilton*, to relieve the King from the hands of *Cromwell*; but he beat that Army at *Preſton*. How you come to ſay in your pamphlet, that the behaviour of the *Preſbyterians* in that reign, was infernal, when it was exactly agreeable to your revolution principles, is what I can't underſtand. After the death of that prince,

the

the *Preſbyterians* in *Scotland*, did all in their power to reſtore his ſon *Charles* II. In 1650 they fought the battle of *Dunbar* againſt *Cromwell*; where about 10,000 of them were deſtroyed. In the next year 1651, they fought the battle of *Worceſter* againſt *Cromwell*, and were beat. In theſe three battles, viz. *Preſton*, *Dunbar*, and *Worceſter*, the Scotch *Preſbyterians* loſt at leaſt 30,000 men by their loyalty; and yet you rank them amongſt the inveterate enemies to kings, becauſe they don't chuſe to be ſlaves to them.

Every body knows that King *Charles* II. was reſtored by *Monk*, who acted in concert with theſe very *Preſbyterian* noblemen in *Scotland* who fought againſt the Tyranny of his father: and when *Monk* came to *London*, he reſtored the old parliament, compoſed moſtly of *Preſbyterians*, who reſtored the ſon, though they alſo fought againſt the tyranny of the father.

We have now taken a ſhort view of the conduct of the *Preſbyterians* during the reign of *James* I. and *Charles* I. and till the reſtoration of *Charles* II. chiefly by their means. Let us now obſerve the return made by that prince to them.

The

The ſecond year after his reſtoration, he perſecuted all the *Proteſtant Diſſenting* miniſters, and in *England* turned them out of their livings. In *Scotland*, although he was bound by a ſolemn oath to the maintainance of the *Preſbyterian* government of the Church, yet he not only forgot that oath, but got acts of parliament made, to perſecute every body who heard miniſters of that perſwaſion, and who baptized any child by them: and his Privy Council in *Scotland*, chiefly under the direction of the Archbiſhop of St. *Andrews*, the Duke of *Lauderdale* ſecretary of ſtate, and Sir *George Mackenzie* the king's Advocate for *Scotland*, did ſo perſecute every body of that perſwaſion, by fines, impriſonments, tortures, and even by death, that it equal'd the perſecutions of the *Roman Catholicks* againſt the *Proteſtants*: and it was no protection for any man, againſt theſe perſecutions, that he had ventur'd his life againſt *Oliver Cromwell*, and in favour of the Royal family, or had been concern'd with General *Monk* to reſtore the king. And amongſt others my own predeceſſor, who had fought in all the aforeſaid three battles, for the royal family, and was concerned with General *Monk* in the king's reſtoration, would have been

been involved in the common ruin, had it not been for the protection procured for him by the Duke of *Rothurſt* Chancelor of *Scotland*. It would be almoſt incredible, the many inventions fallen upon by that infamous court, the then Privy Council of *Scotland*, to force people, by the ſevereſt tortures, to witneſs againſt their neareſt relations, and even againſt themſelves, for having heard a *Preſbyterian* miniſter preach, or having a child baptized by them. And at length the Privy Council, tired with taking the trouble of ſo many proſecutions as came daily before them, gave commiſſions to Officers of the army, to put what queſtions they pleaſed to perſons whoſe loyalty they ſuſpected; and if their anſwers did not ſatisfy them, they were empower'd to put them to death upon the ſpot, without any trial. It was very ordinary in thoſe times, to procure falſe witneſſes, to ſwear againſt gentlemen of good eſtates, that they had ſeen them hearing *Preſbyterian* miniſters preach, in order to get forfeitures. There was a remarkable inſtance of this in the caſe of Sir *Hugh Campbell* of *Ceſnock*, a man remarkable for underſtanding, and every virtue, and poſſeſſed of a very good eſtate, which made him lookt upon as a good forfeiture:

ture: he was Great Grand-father by the Mother's ſide to the preſent Earl of *Marchmount:* he was called before the court, for being preſent where arms were bore againſt the king, and there were two falſe witneſſes procured to ſwear againſt him; one of them actually ſwore againſt him; but when the other was ſworn to tell the truth, Sir *Hugh* deſired the Judges, to cauſe the fellow to turn his face towards him, and then addreſſing himſelf to him, ſaid, Dare you ſay in the preſence of Almighty God, that you ſaw me in the place mentioned in the libel againſt me, or that ever you ſaw me in your life? Upon which the fellow fell a trembling, and as if ſtruck by ſome ſupernatural power, ſaid, Indeed, Sir, I never ſaw you before in my life. This ſaved this great good man, and his eſtate, to the no ſmall aſtoniſhment of his Majeſty's Advocate, and the courtiers, who gaped after his eſtate.

After perſecuting people of this perſwaſion, in their perſons ſingly, they fell upon a more compendious way of doing it, by bringing down ſome thouſands of *Highlanders*, to live at free quarters upon people in the weſt of *Scotland*; which country they pillaged in a pityful manner,

for

for there the whole people were *Preſbyterians*, and ſcarce any body went to hear the Curates of the eſtabliſhed Church, except thoſe in the ſervice of the government.

Probably theſe things may appear to you incredible; and indeed except the perſecutions carried on by order of the *Pope*, againſt the *Albigenſes* and *Waldenſes*, that innocent people, there can ſcarce an inſtance be given of ſuch cruelty exerciſed in *Chriſtendom*. But if you have any doubt of the truth of theſe things, I ſhall inform you where you ſhall find the proofs of them; which will convince you, after a continuation of theſe perſecutions for years together, the people were forced, either to abſtain from publick worſhip in their way, or to carry weapons with them to defend themſelves againſt the dragoons ſent every day after them; and this was called rebellion againſt the government—a rebellion procured by the government itſelf, as theſe poor people wiſhed for no more, than liberty to worſhip God in their own way.

Is not the preſent methods taken, in conſequence of the late acts of parliament, ſomething like

like what was done in thoſe times? The people in *America* are moſtly *Preſbyterians*, and *Proteſtant Diſſenters:* a mob of 40 or 50 Banditti deſtroyed ſome Tea belonging to the Eaſt-India-Company, which was ſent to *Boſton.* Without any proof that the people there were concerned in this mob—their Port is blocked up, they are deprived of trade, and their charter and priviledges as a free people are deſtroyed: and becauſe the people there, and through the reſt of *America*, reſent that oppreſſion, they are called rebellious, although the whole continent of *America* has always been remarkable for their affection to the royal family, and have ſtrained every nerve to ſerve their mother-country againſt its enemies. If this affection ſhould be leſſened, by what has been done againſt *New-England*, and by eſtabliſhing popery in *Canada*, and enlarging its dominions, ſo as to ſurround our *Proteſtant* brethren there by French papiſts, and eſtabliſhing arbitrary power, pray, Sir, who do you think are to blame for this?

Every one is ſenſible of the conſequences of the reſolutions taken by the Congreſs in *America*, compoſed of deputies from every province;

by which the trade of *Great Britain* muſt be ruined, and its manufacturers ſtarved, as the one half of its manufactures went there: and at the ſame time many 100,000 pounds of the national caſh muſt be exported yearly to foreign nations, to procure naval ſtores which we had from our brethren in *America*, in exchange for our manufactures. Add to all this, does not the ruin of the trade of this country, endanger our ſovereign to loſe the affections of his ſubjects at home, tho' he intends nothing but their happineſs. Inſtead of *America* being the cauſe of making us the greateſt nation in *Europe*, we ſhall ſpend our ſtrength in cutting the throats of our brethren, inſtead of reſerving it to protect ourſelves againſt the declared enemies to *Great Britain*. When our trade is ruined, the nurſery of our ſailors diminiſhed, and we engaged in a war with our own ſubjects, don't you think we are in ſome danger of becoming an eaſy conqueſt to *France*: for ſurely you muſt be ſenſible, that our only ſafety and protection againſt them is our fleet. Perhaps you will tell me, that we are in ſtrict friendſhip with them; but I was taught, by that great man the late Lord *Stairs*, when with him at *Paris*, to believe, that they

were

were never more to be ſuſpected, than when they were moſt laviſh of their promiſes of friendſhip. And he uſed to ſay, he was obliged to obſerve this rule with their great men in politicks, ſeldom to believe what they ſaid.

I ſubmit to you, whether the *Presbyterians* and other *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, from what I have ſaid, appear moſt to blame, to the four kings of the *Stewart* family, or theſe kings to them. And as you profeſs to juſtify the Revolution, I think you muſt be of my opinion; for by theſe principles, which appear to me to be the only rational ones with regard to goverment, all government owes its riſe from the people; and the people never can be ſuppoſed to create a government to hurt themſelves. There are reciprocal duties between a government and the people; and as every ſubject owes ſubjection to the government, becauſe that government is ſuppoſed to protect the ſubject; ſo on the contrary, if a government of any kind ſhall, inſtead of protecting the people, declare themſelves their enemies, they can't expect to be ſupported by that people. It was upon this principle the *Romans* expelled the *Tarquins*—it was on this principle that all

the

the free ſtates of *Greece* were eſtabliſhed—and it was on this principle the Revolution by king *William* was eſtabliſhed.

Thus, Sir, I have endeavoured to ſhew you, that you and I are of the ſame opinion; and that you are miſtaken of the *Presbyterians*, when you repreſent them as *Regicides* and enemies to kings; for they never were ſo, except when kings are enemies to themſelves, as well as to their ſubjects, and imagine themſelves, inſtead of being the protectors of their people, to have a right to tyranize over them. Indeed it is evident, that it is the intereſt of kings themſelves, to be obliged to govern by a known law; for wherever abſolute power is, ruin to that country is inevitable. Mr. *Gordon* obſerves, in his *Tacitus*, The breath of a tyrant withers and blaſts the growth of every thing that is valuable. This appears from the hiſtory of all nations, and in none more than from that of *Holland*, when compared now with what it was when under the tyranny of *Spain*; and by comparing the cities of *Greece* now, with what they were, when they enjoyed freedom.

As

As to king *James* II. he was a declared enemy to the liberties and religion of his country; and therefore the *Presbyterians*, as well as the church of *England*, declared againſt him.

As to the *Quebeck* act of parliament, I believe I need not endeavour to convince you, that it ought to be repealed; for by eſtabliſhing popery, in order to get aſſiſtance from the French *Papiſts* againſt our *proteſtant* brethren, it has equally diſobliged theſe French *Papiſts* themſelves, by depriving them of that Britiſh liberty which they were entitled to by becoming Britiſh ſubjects, and which they have enjoyed for ſome years. So that inſtead of continuing good ſubjects, by being poſſeſſed of liberty, in caſe of a war with *France*, ſince they are to be ſlaves, they will naturally rather chuſe to be ſlaves to them than to *Britain*,

As to the fathers of the church, the Biſhops conſenting to this act of parliament, I hope it was from want of attention, and that therefore, they will readily ſollicit the repeal of it. I hope the time is not yet come, that Biſhopricks are diſpoſed of as penſions and places are, to make

parliamentary

parliamentary intereſt. If ever that time ſhould come, that theſe ſhould be the inſtruments of corruption, adieu both to learning and religion: we ſhould then ſee, the being a good fox hunter a recommendation to a biſhoprick, and none promoted to benefices but thoſe connected with members of parliament.

I can't here omit inſerting, the firſt ſentence of that great man Mr *Lock's* Treatiſe upon government, in anſwer to Sir *Robert Firmer*. *Slavery, ſays he, is ſo vile a thing in itſelf, and ſo contrary to the generous temper of our Engliſh nation, that it's ſurprizing to ſee an Engliſhman, much more a gentleman, plead for it. In ſhort, it is political damnation.*

I ſhall here inſert a piece of hiſtory. The Carthagenians came from *Tyre*; and many hundred years after, when they were become a powerful Common Wealth, they made an alliance with *Alexander the Great* againſt the Perſians, but they refuſed to aſſiſt him againſt *Tyre* their mother country. Our miniſtry here make uſe of this pretence for encroaching on the privileges of *America*, that they will become too powerful,

and

and renounce their dependance upon us. Their never was a people who ſhewed greater affection to their mother country than they have done; and without their being conſiderable, they can't make us that great people, which their proſperity muſt make us; and the navigation act, which gives us the command of their trade, muſt always make them ſubject to us. But although this be a mere Phantom, raiſed by people who have a mind to enſlave both them and us, yet if we don't change our meaſure with regard to *America*, we ſhall, by ruining our trade, and our nurſery of ſailors, put it ſoon in the power of *France* to make us a province to them; and nobody doubts, who knows them, of their inclination to make us ſo. What will enable them the eaſier to do this, is, we ſeem to have given up that alliance with the emperor which king *William* made, as our ſureſt protection againſt the ambition of *France*—a nation, whoſe intention always was, and will be, to deſtroy us.

Thus, Sir, I have given you my ſentiments on ſeveral things of conſequence to the publick; and I aſſure you what I have ſaid, ariſes entirely from love to my country and to my ſovereign,

who

who I wiſh to ſee reinſtated in the affections of his ſubjects in *America*, as well as getting an end put to the apprehenſions here, by the ruin of trade with *America*, both here and in the *Weſt-Indies*.

I hope you are convinced of your miſtakes as to King *William*'s character: if I have not ſucceeded in convincing you, you need only read the beſt hiſtorians of his time. And as to the *Preſbyterians*, whom you repreſent as *Regicides* and diſloyal, do but inform yourſelf who compoſed the army of Rebels in *Scotland* in 1715 and in 1745, and you will find that there were not ſix *Preſbyterians* amongſt the many thouſands that made up theſe Rebel Armies; and amongſt ſome thouſands of volunteers who ventured their lives againſt theſe Rebels, you won't find I believe ſix Scotch *Epiſcopals*. And it is notorious, that the Scotch *Preſbyterian* Clergy met at *Glaſgow* in a *Synod*, even when the *Pretender* was at *Edinburgh*, and teſtified the greateſt zeal for the Royal Family. The Duke of *Cumberland*, when he was in *Scotland*, ſhowed the moſt entire confidence in the *Preſbyterian* Clergy, as ſincere friends to the Royal Family: on the contrary,

he

he found thoſe of the *Epiſcopal* perſuaſion ſo univerſally diſloyal, that he ſhut up moſt of their meeting-houſes, as nurſeries of Rebellion. If theſe things are matters of fact, I hope they will reconcile you to the *Preſbyterians*, as loyal ſubjects to a ſovereign whom you profeſs to admire, and to whom you own yourſelf obliged.

I have no view of intereſt in writing the above; all the reward I wiſh for venturing my life and fortune againſt the Rebels, and expending ſo much money, is to ſee his majeſty follow ſuch meaſures as are beſt fitted to fix him and his family in the affections of his ſubjects, both here and in *America*.

It is not eaſy to account for *Proteſtant* Biſhops conſenting not only to the eſtabliſhment of *Popery* in any part of his Majeſty's dominions, but likewiſe greatly to enlarge the bounds of theſe dominions ſubjected to the popiſh Religion and the laws of *France*: by which enlargement of dominions, theſe French Papiſts are eſtabliſhed on the back of our *Proteſtant* brethren. I ſay, it is not eaſy to account for this conduct, except from this principle, that theſe our *Proteſtant*

brethren make every Parſon of a pariſh a Biſhop there, whereas a Biſhop in *England* has the inſpection of a whole province. Now I ſubmit it to the judgment of any ſenſible man, whether that difference of opinion be of ſuch conſequence, as to make the Biſhops of *England* prefer *Popery* to the *Proteſtant* religion; as the *Presbyterians* and our other *Proteſtant* brethren there, maintain the ſame articles of belief with thoſe of the Church of England in all doctrinal points. It is very well known the deſire the Biſhops have ſhown to introduce the Epiſcopal government into *America*; but the reaſons the *Americans* have againſt it ſeem to be unanſwerable; for at the ſame time the Biſhops were eſtabliſhed, Archdeacons, Deans, Prebends, Canons, &c. muſt follow their eſtabliſhment: and I have ſeldom met with people of underſtanding, who do not think that the emoluments applied to the ſupport of theſe idle people, would be much better applied to the ſupport of poor parſons of pariſhes and Curates, many of whom are ſtarving, when thoſe idle people have more than they have occaſion for. I have heard it computed, that they poſſeſs the much greater part of the whole revenues of the church. Although at the reformation,

mation, the reformers could not correct every abuſe; and conſidering the Clergy have been long in poſſeſſion of theſe uſeleſs emoluments, which might make it troubleſome at this day to correct them, yet it would be ridiculous in the people of *America* to ſubmit themſelves to ſo enormous an expence, to ſupport a number of idle people, who do no other ſervice to the publick, but ſpend their large income in ſuperfluities.

The blocking up of the Port of *Boſton*, and ruining the trade of *North America*, by a law now propoſed to be made to ſtarve the Americans, by preventing their fiſhing on the banks of *Newfoundland*, appears to me to be ſuch ſeverity as to be inconſiſtant with the treatment a government owes a free people; eſpecially when it is conſidered, that the pretence for this ſeverity is only this, that they refuſe to ſubmit to a Tax impoſed contrary to their charters, and the privileges they have been in poſſeſſion of for 200 years. There was a motion made in a great aſſembly, that had the appearance of moderation, by a miniſter, ſome weeks ago, but had no meaning in the opinion of people of underſtanding,

ding, but to divide the provinces of *America*, the only way to ruin them one after another: for no man of underſtanding can believe, that a miniſter, capable of ruining a whole province, where ſome hundred thouſands of his Majeſty's ſubjects dwell, and which has diſtinguiſhed itſelf by its zeal to ſerve *Great Britain* againſt its enemies, becauſe a mob there threw into the Sea ſome cheſts of Tea, can have any good intentions to any province in *America*, who will not ſubmit themſelves to his abſolute will. By which ſubmiſſion the fund of corruption muſt be increaſed, to deſtroy the liberties both of *America* and *Great Britain*; and we ſhould ſoon ſee penſioners and placemen multiply in *America*, as they do here and in *Ireland*, in order to carry on the arbitrary views of a miniſter.

The ſituation of *America* at preſent ſeems to me to be much the ſame with that of *Carthage*, when it was ruined by the *Romans*. The *Romans*, after rejecting every reaſonable offer from the *Carthaginians*, ſent an army againſt *Carthage*, under the command of *Scipio*; who, though a good natur'd man, had poſitive inſtructions from the ſenate to agree to no terms but what the *Romans*

mans called a *Deditio*, which put it in their power to uſe them as they pleaſed. The *Carthaginians* being ſoothed with a great many fair words, and told of a great many inſtances of the Roman generoſity, agreed to it. The firſt thing demanded of them, was to burn all the Ships; after that was done, the ſecond demand was to deliver up all their arms; the third was to allow their city to be deſtroyed, and to go, like a parcel of vagabonds, with their wives and children, where they had a mind. We began with impoſing Taxes on *America*, contrary to the charters and privileges they were in poſſeſſion of; then becauſe they reſented that, and were determined to live a free people, we ſent a fleet to block up their principal Harbour, and a land army to block them up by land; then we ſeized on the powder and arms belonging to the province, and now we are about to paſs an act of parliament to ſtarve them, by deſtroying their fiſheries, by which they were maintained. This muſt of courſe beggar them, and deſtroy their ſhips; which is a ſcheme, though not conſiſtent with humanity, yet perfectly agreeable to the ſyſtem practiſed in all ages by people who have a mind to introduce arbitrary power; as it is much

much eaſier to make ſlaves of diſpirited beggars, than of people who enjoy the bleſſings of life, amongſt which liberty is the firſt. It is given out, I am told, by people in power, that they have nothing but good intentions towards any of the provinces of *America*, who are willing to own the ſupreme power of *Great Britain*. If that was all the miniſtry intended, there can be no occaſion for putting the nation to the expence of a great army and fleet to inforce it, as nobody in *America* ever denied it. But if the miniſtry want to eſtabliſh arbitrary power through *America*, as they have done in *Canada*, they judge it right in thinking force neceſſary: but as I own myſelf a lover of liberty and hater of ſlavery, I ſhould be ſorry to ſee that army ſucceed, if ſuch is their intention; as I am thoroughly convinced, that, by the continuation of the liberties of *America*, *Great Britain* would be the greateſt Nation in *Europe*. And beſides, being enabled by their aſſiſtance to keep *France* and *Spain* in awe, we ſhould get from *America* in exchange for our manufactures, what coſts us ſome millions of money, viz. Naval Stores, Raw Silk, Wines, Fruits, &c. whereas by loſing *America*, or by enſlaving it, which is the ſame thing, we

ſhould

ſhould effectually loſe all theſe advantages. I could never ſee any other conſequence of theſe American ſchemes, but deſtruction to *Great Britain*, and advancing the intereſt and power of *France* and *Spain*, by ruining our trade, and diminiſhing the number of our ſailors, from whom alone we derive our ſecurity.

There is ſomething in our ſituation at preſent, that puts me in mind of the ſituation of *France* during the adminiſtration of *Anne* of *Auſtria*, during the minority of *Lewis* XIV. *Cardinal Richlieu* had gone a great way to eſtabliſh the arbitrary power of the king, by deſtroying the independency of many great families in *France*; but ſtill the parliaments had great power, and it was reſerved to the cunning of *Cardinal Mazarine* to deſtroy the power of parliaments. The parliament of *Paris* being ſenſible of the deſign of that miniſter to eſtabliſh arbitrary power in the king, attacked him ſo vigorouſly, that *Anne* of *Auſtria*, the regent, found it abſolutely neceſſary to conſent to his leaving *France*. But afterwards, he and ſhe had the art to cajole the Duke of *Orleans*, a weak prince, and the Prince of *Conde*, though a great general, yet a weak politician,

politician, to conſent to his being recalled; by their agreeing to this, that the government ſhould be in the hands of theſe two princes, under whom the Cardinal was to act. But he ſoon ſhowed them the danger to a free people by truſting to the promiſes of a miniſter, who had once declared himſelf reſolved to enſlave them. If our miniſter ſhall ſucceed in depriving the Americans of their liberties, I have no doubt of ſeeing ſome miniſter ſo hardy, as to endeavour the deſtruction of the liberties of *Great Britain*. Sweden, about 200 years ago, had a ſenate with much the ſame powers our parliament has: the court, by the force of money, got a majority in parliament, by introducing penſioners and officers of the army into it; who betrayed their conſtituents, by making the king arbitrary. I think I have heard it computed, that in our laſt Houſe of Commons, there were upwards of a hundred members which belonged either to the army or the fleet; but how many penſioners I know not: only I never heard there was many in the majority who had neither poſt nor penſion, or ſome reverſionary grant from the crown. We were freed from arbitary power in *Charles* I.'s time, by the bravery of a Houſe of Commons, though

afterwards

afterwards both that houſe and the king were deſtroyed by the army. We were afterwards ſaved from *Popery* and ſlavery by that great prince King *William:* and I hope his preſent majeſty will never be ſo unfortunate as to put his truſt in any miniſter who ſhall dare to adviſe him to ſubvert our preſent happy conſtitution—for the preſervation of which, the preſent royal family were eſtabliſhed, and the next heir to the Crown was excluded.

There have been many inſtances, both in ancient and modern hiſtory, of Nations ruined by the degeneracy of aſſemblies of the greateſt reputation for virtue and publick ſpirit. The *Amphictyons* were an aſſembly of repreſentatives from all the cities of *Greece*, and there never was an aſſembly which for many years had a greater reputation for virtue and publick ſpirit; but at length *Philip* of *Macedon*, who had form'd a ſcheme to overturn the liberties of *Greece*, bribed them, and they made him one of their members, under the cover of his being their defender. By this he had a pretence for meddling in their affairs, and by that deſtroyed the liberties and ſpirit of the greateſt and braveſt people the world

ever ſaw. Our caſe ſeems to be ſomething like theirs. *Lewis* XIV. King of *France*, formed a ſcheme to overturn the liberties of *Europe*. By a confederacy formed by that great prince king *William*, between *England*, the *Empire*, and *Holland*, in which *England* contributed the moſt, that ambitious prince was diſappointed. As *France* knew that *Great Britain* was the greateſt obſtacle againſt their ambitious views, they have been ever endeavouring to detach it from the *Empire*, with whom King *William* had formed an aliance, as the ſure bulwark againſt the ambitious views of *France*: but Sir *Robert Walpole* was cajolled by *Cardinal Fleury* to renounce the alliance of the houſe of *Auſtria*, and to make an aliance with that of *Bourbon:* the fatal effect of which was found in our laſt war with *France*, where we were left alone to defend the Electorate of *Hanover*, which coſt the nation about thirty millions ſterling; which enormous expence muſt have been prevented, had our alliance with the houſe of *Auſtria* continued. We now ſeem to court *France* as our beſt friend, and follow a quite different policy by doing ſo, than ever any miniſtry before did. When I was in *France* with the late Lord *Stair*, he followed this rule, never

to truſt to the promiſes of that court: but now we ſeem to have perfect reliance on theſe promiſes, and to take the *French* into our confidence as our beſt friends; and they have now the pleaſure, to ſee us ſending the greateſt part of our troops and navy to deſtroy the liberties of our own Colonies. They knew, that, by the continuation of our friendſhip with theſe Colonies, we ſhould ſoon become the greateſt nation in Europe; whereas, by quarrelling with them, we ſhould ruin our trade and manufactures, and conſequently deſtroy the nurſery of our ſailors, and ſo become an eaſy prey to *France*. And I ſhould not be ſurprized, old as I am, to ſee myſelf a ſubject of *France*, by *Great Britain*'s becoming part of their dominions.

There was another court at *Athenss* in *Greece*, called *Areopagus*, equally remarkable for integrity and publick ſpirit as the *Amphictyons*; which court by corruption became equally bad. The *Senate* of *Rome*, moſt remarkable for virtue and publick ſpirit, became the betrayers of the liberties of their country, and ſoon after became the inſtruments of deſpotick power. In modern times, we ſee the ſame effects from the ſame cauſe.

cauſe. The *Cortez* of *Spain*, who had equally the power of granting money to the king as our Houſe of Commons has, was, by the influence of the court, prevailed on to impower the king to raiſe money, in order to conquer the *Moors*: and under the pretence, that the *Moors* were not yet conquered, the king continued to exerciſe that power, and never called the *Cortez* again. Thus the liberties of *Spain* were ruined. King *Charles* II. did all in his power to corrupt his parliaments; and ſo far ſucceeded, that one of his parliaments was called the *penſion-parliament*. Had he not laviſhed away ſo much of his money upon his miſtreſſes, perhaps he might have ſucceeded in enſlaving the nation. This, and the integrity of his miniſter lord *Clarendon*, who refuſed to concur with this bad prince, in his views of arbitrary power, ſaved the nation from ſlavery. And ſurely there never was a prince, who, under the cover of good humour and pleaſantry, did more wicked things: for under a pretence of religion, of which he had no more than his horſe, he perſecuted thoſe very people who ſet him on the throne; and exerciſed the ſame kind of cruelties againſt his ſubjects, as the papiſts did againſt the proteſtants, becauſe they could not

in

in conſcience comply with his order concerning the worſhip of God. This he did, contrary to the moſt ſolemn oaths he had taken to ſupport thoſe very people whom he perſecuted. When the duke of *Lauderdale* was complained of to him, as the author of the moſt cruel perſecutions in *Scotland*, by tortures, impriſonments, forfeitures, hanging, &c. he ſaid, in his merry jocoſe way, that he had been indeed ſevere upon his ſubjects, but that he had ſerved him faithfully; as if a miniſter could be a friend to his prince who was an enemy to his ſubjects.

I hear the people in *America* are ſo alarmed on hearing the intention of our miniſtry to ſend a great army and fleet againſt them, that they are raiſing an army of obſervation, to prevent their being under the abſolute power of that army, as to their lives, liberties and properties. I wiſh, that before we had ſent that army, our miniſtry, if they really mean to make up matters with *America* in a peaceable way, had firſt tried the inclinations of the Americans as to what propoſals they had to make; for uſing force on one ſide, naturally produces force on the other, eſpecially when that force is ſent by people who had

had ſhown no friendly diſpoſition towards them; and that old ſaying of a Trojan, when the Greeks profeſſed friendſhip to them, has been always thought wiſe, *Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes*,

I am told there has been a pamphlet publiſhed by one *Becket*, advancing a very extraordinary doctrine, viz. That it would be proper to impower the crown to raiſe taxes by its own authority, in times of neceſſity. If this doctrine was approved of by parliament, our ſituation would be the ſame with that of *Spain* in *Charles* V. the emperor's time, when the *Cortez* of *Spain* granted that power to the crown, under the pretence of neceſſity; which enabled the crown never to call a *Cortez* afterwards, for they always found out ſome cauſe of neceſſity for continuing that power. I hear the houſe of peers have ordered that pamphlet to be burnt by the hands of the hangman—but is that ſufficient puniſhment for an author, who durſt advance a doctrine which at once deſtroys the Britiſh conſtitution, and eſtabliſhes arbitrary power; which, as I have ſaid before, I look upon as political damnation. It appears how the *Romans* prized the leaſt breathing

breathing of liberty, during the time of their emperors, by looking into *Tacitus*'s hiſtory of the reign of *Trajan*, which he calls *Rara Tempora*, when the *Romans* could ſpeak or write what they thought, without being ruined by it: for as the moſt part of thoſe emperors were monſters of cruelty, ſo they perſecuted every body who regarded virtue, and who did not approve of their vile actions.

Tavernier, the famous jeweller, who went round the globe oftener than once, and made a conſiderable fortune, at length bought an eſtate in *Switzerland:* afterwards being at the court of *France*, he was aſked by *Lewis* XIV. why he did not rather chuſe to buy an eſtate in *France*, he made him this anſwer: *I choſe to ſettle what I had acquired by ſo much pains-taking, in a country where I could call what I had my own, without its being in the power of any body to take it from me.*

To conclude; I am ſo much of *Tavernier*'s opinion, that I would rather live in the wildeſt part of the Highlands of *Scotland*, under our preſent happy conſtitution, than in the fineſt county

county of *England*, under an arbitrary prince. And as I bore arms againſt the Pretender in 1715, in defence of the liberties and religion of my country, ſo I ſhall end life in wiſhing there may be always found a ſufficient number of Britiſh ſubjects, who will be able to defend that happy conſtitution which that great prince king *William* put us in poſſeſſion of, till time ſhall be no more —and for that purpoſe, hope ſome method ſhall be found to deſtroy luxury and diſſipation, which at preſent threatens the deſtruction of this country———This, and a good correſpondence with *America*, is neceſſary to ſave us from Ruin.

I am, &c.

P. S. I have been obliged to repeat ſome material things contained in my Letter to you, becauſe of their connection with the following obſervations.

A

LETTER

TO THE

AUTHOR OF A PAMPHLET,

CALLED

TAXATION NO TYRANNY.

SIR,

I Have read your ingenious pamphlet, by which you make as much of the ſubject you write on as it is capable of: but I ſubmit a few obſervations on the ſubject of it to your conſideration.

1. You ſay, that it is the right of the ſupreme power, in every community, to demand the neceſſary contributions from thoſe who are ſubject

to it, and that this was never denied till lately, by the lovers of anarchy in *America*.

I never heard that the *Americans* denied this poſition; but they affirmed another poſition, That that ſupreme power may give to ſettlers in any new Colony what privileges they think proper. All lands are derived to the ſubject from the ſovereign; and the moment they are in the crown, they can be given by it to the ſubject, on what condition it pleaſes. This is the rule with regard to charters granted by the crown, even here in *Britain*; and when theſe charters are granted, they cannot be violated by the crown, nay nor by the parliament, juſtly; for the nature of a free government is ſuch, that all property is inviolable, except the poſſeſſor of it do ſomething which forfeits the right he has to the protection of his property, by the laws of his country. There are inſtances, to be ſure, where, for the publick good, private property may be exchanged for its value with the proprietor: but theſe things are never to be done, except in caſes of neceſſity. The caſe of the *Americans* is ſtill more favourable: their predeceſſors, at the riſk of their lives and fortunes, enlarged the

the *Britiſh* dominions, and had charters granted them by the crown for their encouragement; and, amongſt other privileges, they had a power given them of taxing themſelves, which they have poſſeſſed for about 200 years. And would it be right for either king or parliament to take of theſe ſubjects in *America* their money, in any other way than what is approved of by their charters? If it be ſaid, that this privilege of taxing themſelves is not excluſive of any taxation by parliament; the anſwer is evident, That in that caſe their privileges, by their charter, of taxing themſelves are nothing, becauſe a parliament may tax them to the utmoſt they can bear, and then tell them, they may tax themſelves when they pleaſe, when they can bear no more. This new ſcheme of miniſters breaking in upon charters in *America*, and their conſtant cuſtom for about 200 years, has always appeared to me below the dignity of the crown and parliament, who have both of them often homologated theſe privileges, by the continuation of which, we ſhould in a few years be the greateſt nation in *Europe*, and by oppreſſing *America* we ſhall loſe our trade with them, ruin our manufacturers, leſſen the number of our ſailors, and conſequent-

ly

ly leſſen our ſecurity againſt our natural enemy the *French*.

2. You ſay, it would be a reflection upon *Engliſh* power and *Engliſh* honour not to tax *America*. In my opinion, inſtead of being a reflection upon *Engliſh* power and *Engliſh* honour not to exert its power of taxation, which you ſeem to think, it would be to the honour and glory of *England* not to break through what they themſelves have eſtabliſhed, and to keep their faith religiouſly with their brethren in *America*. And although they had no charter nor privileges, I think it would be our intereſt to grant them the privileges they deſire; for by that alone they are become a great people, and able to aſſiſt their mother country, and by that they will be every year the more able to aſſiſt it. And that opinion propagated with ſo much induſtry by penſioners and placemen, of their becoming independent of their mother country, is a mere chimera; they neither wiſh it, nor can it ever be in their power, the navigation act being a bar to it, as by that we command their trade.

3. You

3. You obſerve, that the advocates for *America* here are enemies to their native country. It ſeems as clear to me as any propoſition in *Euclid*, that nothing can preſerve this country but a good correſpondence with *America*, and that the late acts of parliament in the laſt ſeſſions, muſt ruin that good correſpondence, if put in execution. Is it poſſible, that you can think that the *Americans* can ſee themſelves ſurrounded by *French* Papiſts in *Canada* with indifferency; and can any good Proteſtant in *Britain* ſee Popery made the eſtabliſhed religion in *Canada*, and the extent of that province enlarged to double of what it was, and to ſee ſlavery eſtabliſhed there by law, and to ſee the trade of this country with *America* ruined, by which our nurſery of ſailors is greatly diminiſhed, and our manufacturers undone? Can any man in *Britain* ſee with indifference, that inſtead of being furniſhed with naval ſtores from the northern powers of *Europe*, at the expence of near two millions a year, and that we were now ſure of being furniſhed with theſe things from *America*, in exchange for our manufactures, and that now by theſe acts of parliament we are in danger of loſing all theſe advantages, and the proſpect of

many

many more, by being furniſhed with other things from thence, ſuch as, Raw Silk, Fruits, Wines, &c. It is true, Sir, we ought to regard the *Americans* as our brethren, and ſo not to encroach upon their privileges.

But there is another conſideration ſtill more powerful, that every ſtep taken againſt the *Americans* hurries us on to our own deſtruction. Our predeceſſors, for theſe 200 years, have thought it right to encourage the *Americans*, as the beſt way to aggrandize *Great Britain*. But our preſent miniſtry ſeem to think otherwiſe; for what reaſon, I know not. Is it not evident, that *France*, our natural enemy, is more powerful now than in *Lewis* XIV.'s time, by the addition of *Lorrain* to its territories, by which they can maintain 30,000 troops more then before? their riches from *America* are three times greater than they were in *Lewis* XIV.'s time; and yet we ſeem to have forgot, that, in his time, *France* alone was a match for *Great Britain*, the Emperor, the Empire, *Spain*, *Holland*, and the Duke of *Savoy*. Do we imagine, that that ambitious nation is now aſleep, or have dropt all ambitious views? No, they are acting now the

wiſeſt

wiſeſt part they ever did, to accompliſh their ambitious views againſt us; they are preparing for war by paying off their debts, while we don't ſeem to think of paying off ours, by our encroaching on the ſinking fund every year, and now we are contracting more debts, by ſending a great fleet and a numerous army to deſtroy our own colonies, and the principal branch of our trade, and the ſupport of our manufacturers, whilſt we neglect to ſupport and vindicate the honour and intereſt of the nation, by allowing our trade with foreign nations to be ruined contrary to the moſt ſolemn treaties, which we have been in poſſeſſion of for about 100 years; witneſs our trade with *Portugal*, which, before they broke through their treaties with us, yielded us about a million of balance yearly, and does not now yeild above one tenth of that ſum; and can any honeſt *Britiſh* ſubject not wiſh that our fleet and forces had been employed rather in ſupporting our trade with foreign nations, than in endeavouring to ruin our own plantations and the principal branch of our trade. *France* has the ſatisfaction to ſee us follow the very meaſures they would have dictated for our deſtruction, by ruining our correſpondence with *America*; by a good

good correſpondence with which, they eaſily ſaw, we muſt, in leſs than an age, become the greateſt nation in *Europe*. You ſpeak in one part of your Pamphlet of the great increaſe of inhabitants in *America*, in a way that is unworthy of the pen of ſo ſenſible an author. You ſay, they multiply like their rattle-ſnakes. If you was among them, perhaps inſtead of tar and feathers, ſome giddy-headed mob might condemn you to keep company with thoſe very animals you compare them to.

4. You ſay in defence of theſe acts of parliament againſt *America*, that it is time to curb them before they turn too powerful. I am clearly of opinion with Sir *Robert Walpole*, that the more numerous, rich, and powerful they are, the better for their mother country, becauſe their riches centre here; and the more numerous they are, the more occaſion they have for our manufactures: and that ſenſible miniſter, as I am well informed, when preſſed to tax *America*, always ſaid, that the only right way to tax them was to encourage their trade with us, and their demand for our manufactures, which muſt increaſe as the number of inhabitants in *America* in-

increaſed; for, ſaid he, the laſt buyer of goods always pays the taxes raiſed by theſe goods. This tax they don't grudge to pay, but would grudge to pay taxes directly laid upon them by any body but their own aſſemblies.

The politicks of our miniſters now ſeems to be quite different from that of their predeceſſors for near theſe 200 years paſt: and the opinion of moſt people I converſe with, inſtead of thinking it our intereſt, by encouraging the people of *America* by ſupporting their privileges, they ſeem to follow the politicks of King *Philip* II. of *Spain*, who employed his armies and fleets in endeavouring to ruin the privileges of *Holland* and *Flanders*. In doing of which he ſpent about a hundred and fifty millions ſterling. When told by ſome honeſt man about him, that it was againſt his intereſt to ruin ſo valuable a part of his dominions, he ſaid, that he would rather be king of a wilderneſs where his will was abſolute, than of the richeſt provinces of the world where his ſubjects durſt contradict it. We are in no danger from the increaſe of power in *America*. No people ever ſhewed a more ſincere love to their

mother country than they have done, and by the navigation act we command their trade.

By the preſent ſcheme of our miniſters, they ſeem to want to provoke the *Americans* to loſe their natural affection for their mother country, and to force them into rebellion, by leaving them no choice, either to be ſlaves or to reſiſt government. This caſe is juſt the ſame with what happened in *Scotland* in the reign of *Charles* II. The country was quite peaceable, but by the contrivances of Archbiſhop *Sharp*, the Duke of *Lauderdale*, and Sir George *Mackenzie* his majeſty's advocate, they were perſecuted with fines, tortures, and death, for worſhiping God in their own way: which obliged them, when they heard their miniſters preach in the fields, to carry weapons of defence with them in caſe of their being attacked by the kings forces, who hunted them every where to deſtroy them—and this was called rebellion.

Is not the caſe of the *Americans* ſomething like this? they are deprived of their privileges by charter and 200 years poſſeſſion; they are ſurrounded by French papiſts in *Canada*, which province

province is enlarged double to what it was; and arbitrary power eſtabliſhed there, and Popery declared to be the eſtabliſhed religion, contrary to the act of ſettlement in the royal family; and lately, by a new act of parliament they are deprived of that ſubſiſtance, by fiſhing, which their ſituation gave them, by which their ſhips muſt rot, and they themſelves muſt ſtarve: and becauſe they ſeem to be ſenſible of theſe pieces of oppreſſion, they are called rebels to their mother country by the miniſtry, and by you, Sir, lovers of anarchy and bad ſubjects, though they have always ſhewn themſelves ready to ſacrifice their lives and fortunes in the ſervice of their mother country: but it ſeems nothing elſe will do, but an abſolute ſubmiſſion to arbitrary power, and giving up their privileges, in your opinion.

5. You ſay, our ſhewing our ſuperiority is the only way to make our trade profitable with *America*. Hitherto the ſenſible part of mankind have thought that trade was to flouriſh only by indulgencies, and not by force; you think quite otherways: and I ſhall uſe no other argument to convince you of your miſtake, than to refer you to the applications to parliament from moſt of the

the trading towns in *England*, and amongſt others from *London*, ſhewing the deſtructive conſequences to trade by the meaſures now followed by the miniſtry.

6. This author ſeems to laugh at the patriots of *America* leaving their maritime towns, and retiring into the country, as a chimera: but if he will look back into the practice of the Dutch in 1672, when threatened with ſlavery by *Lewis* XIV, he will ſee that real patriots, who put a juſt value on liberty, are capable of doing much more than that which he calls a chimera. They were obliged by force to abandon the moſt conſiderable parts of the Seven Provinces, and retired where they had no other defence but to overflow their country by the ſea. When *Lewis* XIV. ſent the meſſage to the prince of *Orange*, afterwards king *William*, repreſenting to him the impoſſibility there was of defending his country longer; he anſwered, He ſhould have the pleaſure at leaſt of dying in the laſt ditch. If you will look into the hiſtory of *Rome*, you will ſee, by the reſiſtance made by that little republick of *Numantia* in *Spain* to the whole power of *Rome*, what a value brave men put upon liberty.

ty. They never exceeded 4 or 5000 men, and yet beat a *Roman* army of three times their number, and obliged them to go under the yoke: and when at length they were ſurrounded by a very great *Roman* army, the *Romans* choſe to ſtarve them, by ſurrounding their town by deep trenches, rather than come to blows with ſuch determined men, who were reſolved to die rather than become ſlaves. You will ſee the ſame happened in *Sweden* in *Guſtavus Erickſon*'s time, when the inhabitants of the province of *Dalecarlia*, not accuſtomed to arms, beat 20,000 *Daniſh* regular troops, and drove them out of *Sweden*.

7. You ſay, that all governments are ultimately and eſſentially abſolute, but different depending ſocieties may have different emoluments and privileges from the ſupreme power.—The laſt part of what you advance is all the *Americans* deſire; that is, the privileges the ſupreme power in *Britain* has granted them, and what they have been in poſſeſſion of for theſe 200 years, by the conſent of both king and parliament.—As you obſerve every ſupreme power muſt be abſolute in the management of publick affairs, but if that power which is from the people, (from whom

whom it muſt always originate) ſhould declare itſelf an enemy to the people and their privileges, (from whom they derive their power) nobody who underſtand the principles of government properly, will deny, that theſe people have a right to call that ſupreme power, appointed by themſelves, to an accounr for betraying their truſt. As for example, if the parliament of *Britain* ſhould betray the truſt put in them by their conſtituents, and declare the crown abſolute, the people who choſe them would have an undoubted right to puniſh them for breach of truſt; and the power would revert back to the people. This was the caſe with *Sweden*, who about 200 years ago were betrayed by the ſenate, who made the king abſolute, by the crown having procured a majority in the ſenate compoſed of officers of the army, penſioners, and placemen.

8. You ſay, that every Engliſhman, and every colony, may be deprived of his or their privileges by the ſupreme authority, without that ſupreme authority giving any reaſons for their actions.

This

This is a poſition directly contrary to all true principles of free government. There is indeed a thing practiſed in *Britain* by bills of attainder, in caſes where proof againſt criminals are not ſo clear as the common law requires, but yet are ſuch as to convince the ſupreme power, who paſſed theſe bills, of the guilt of the perſon. Such was the caſe of the biſhop of *Rocheſter*. But I believe it never came into any body's head, who underſtood the principles of a free government, to maintain that the ſupreme power was not obliged to give a reaſon for their proceeding. In that caſe of the biſhop of *Rocheſter*, and in every other bill of attainder, as far as I know, the ſupreme power always gave reaſons for their proceedings. In all free governments, every ſubject enjoys his property under an abſolute ſecurity, that no power whatever can take it from him, as long as he does not forfeit the protection of the laws of his country. Indeed it is true, that if the king and parliament ſhould deprive any ſubject of what they have a right to, by charter or other privilege, that private perſon muſt ſubmit, becauſe he has not power to do otherways: but that action of that power would

would be againſt the axiom of the law of nature, of the law of nations, and the civil law, that no power can do what they cannot do juſtly: and if the king and parliament ſhould declare the rights of any county in *England* forfeited, without any juſt cauſe, or giving any reaſon for it, as you ſay they may do, I believe all the reſt of the counties of *England* would join in protecting that county. The juſt privileges and rights of our brethren in *America* are upon the ſame footing with our own. And I hope in God, it never will enter into the head of any prince of the preſent royal family, who are eſtabliſhed on the throne to ſupport the religion and liberties of this country, to maintain this poſition of yours as juſt. I am very ſure his preſent Majeſty will never do any thing againſt the liberties of his ſubjects any where willingly—but the beſt of princes may be impoſed upon by bad counſellors, under falſe pretences.

There was an inſtance in *Scotland*, in the reign of king *Robert Bruce*, which ſhews the danger that the greateſt princes may be in, by attempting to encroach on what his ſubjects think they have

have a right to poſſeſs. He called a parliament, and inſiſted on every body ſhewing their charters and rights to the lands they were in poſſeſſion of. At that time few people had regular charters for their lands, and long poſſeſſion was their principal right. Upon this propoſal from the king, tho' he was the greateſt prince that ever was in the nation, and the moſt beloved, they unanimouſly drew their ſwords, and ſaid, they would defend by theſe, the poſſeſſions derived to them from their anceſtors. The king was too wiſe a man to inſiſt on this propoſal, which had been ſuggeſted to him by ſome greedy courtiers, who wanted to profit by it.

9. Next you maintain, there can be no limited government.——I did not imagine, that any body of knowledge in theſe matters could have maintained ſuch a poſition in this country, where government is univerſally underſtood to be limited; that is, in other words, that it is derived from the people, and conſequently accountable to the people, when it acts contrary to the ends of its inſtitution. This poſition of yours might have had ſome chance to have met with ſome ſupporters in the days of that pedantical

king, *James* I. of *England*, who dreamed that he had his commiſſion only from God, and was not accountable to his people for any of his actions. He ſaid, he would not turn away the leaſt cook in his kitchen at the deſire of his parliament; and that they had no rights but what they derived from the indulgence of his predeceſſors. The principles of government are now ſo well underſtood, that ſuch idle conceits would be looked upon as the reveries of a diſtempered brain, by the ſenſible part of mankind.

10. You ſay, He that denies the *Engliſh* parliament the power of taxing *America*, denies them the power of making any other laws to regulate the *Americans*.——There is no conſequence can be drawn from denying the power of taxation, to denying the power of making laws. The power of taxation being fixed in the Aſſemblies in *America* by charters and long poſſeſſion, often homologated by king and parliament; whereas the laws of *Britain* have been adopted in *America*; and the navigation act, by which we are impowered to regulate their trade, has never been denied by the *Americans* as binding them.

11. You ſay it is a falſe poſition to ſay, that every man in *England* is taxed by his own conſent, for moſt of the inhabitants have no ſuch privilege, either by himſelf or his choice of delegates.

By all the laws I know, conſent may be either expreſs or tacit; and a tacit conſent is often as binding as an expreſs conſent in the diſpoſal of property. For example; If I allow a man to take poſſeſſion of a part of my property, to which I have a right by charter, that man, or his heirs, may acquire a right to that part of my property by preſcription, eſtabliſhed by long poſſeſſion; and the law will preſume that I conſented to it, altho' he can't produce any poſitive proof of that conſent. By the ſame rule, every man in *England* is preſumed to have given his conſent to our preſent conſtitution, as it has exiſted for many years beyond the longeſt preſcription, without being complained of by any of thoſe people who have no right to chuſe their repreſentatives in parliaments.

12. You ſay the *Americans* have the ſame power of making a king as they have of making a parliament to tax themſelves.

Surely

Surely, Sir, you can't be in earneſt in advancing ſo ſtrange a poſition. Let us put your argument in the ſhape of a ſyllogiſm, and it will run thus: The *Americans* have a power granted them by king and parliament to tax themſelves, *ergo*, they have a power of making a king and parliament. Don't you think that a man might very juſtly deny the conſequence. The hiſtorians tell you, that it was a practice with *Socrates*, to ſave himſelf long reaſoning, to make his adverſary's opinion appear ridiculous to the man himſelf, by putting his anſwer in a ſhort ſyllogiſm like this.

13. You ſay the *Americans* are in the ſame ſituation as towns in *England* who have no repreſentatives in parliament.

This poſition of yours is juſt as extraordinary as the laſt. At firſt when the conſtitution of *England* was formed, towns were allowed votes in parliament, according as they were thought conſiderable enough in the ſtate as to deſerve it. And theſe towns not conſiderable enough as to deſerve to be repreſented in parliament, had no ſuch privilege. And theſe laſt mentioned towns having

having tacitly conſented to that conſtitution then eſtabliſhed, cannot complain of that eſtabliſhment. Tho' at the ſame time I think when a town turns conſiderable, which was not ſo at the beginning of the conſtitution, it has a right to petition king and parliament to be repreſented.

This reaſoning of yours, with regard to towns, is the very ſame with what it was in regard to ſome individuals not having a right to be repreſented. Here I ſhall ſubmit another ſylogiſm to your conſideration. —— A porter and a cobler having no property in *Britain*, have no right to complain they have no repreſentative in parliament; and therefore all the people of *America*, where there are ſome millions poſſeſſed of great property, have no reaſon to complain they are taxed without being repreſented, and without their conſent.

14. You ſay the caſe of *Ireland* is different from *America*, becauſe it has a parliament of its own.

Put the caſe that the parliament of *Ireland* was called the aſſembly of *Ireland*, and the caſe would

would be the ſame; only with this difference, that the caſe of *America* is much ſtronger. The parliament of *Ireland* had their rights and privileges granted them by the king and parliament of *England*, after they were conquered by them, and ſo by the right of conqueſt might preſcribe what rules they thought proper. The caſe is otherways with regard to *America*, moſt of theſe lands were conquered by private people, emigrants from *Britain*, at the danger of their lives and fortunes; to which lands *Great Britain* had no pretence of any right. I ſubmit it to you whether they had not a better right to expect indulgencies from *Great Britain*, then a country conquered at the expence of ſo much blood and treaſure. At the ſame time, I think the parliament of *Ireland* have as good a title to tax *Ireland*, as the parliament of *Britain* to tax us; although by your way of reaſoning you ſeem to think that our parliament is ſo almighty, that they may diſpoſe of charters, privileges and rights of all ſorts, as they think proper, without being obliged to give any reaſon for what they do: but I imagine, Sir, if they were to make a practice of ſuch proceedings, general or frequent, the people of *Britain* might be apt to tell them,

them, they acted beyond the power they intended to give them, and shew them they were still their superiors, and they only their servants, acting under their authority.

15. You say the *Americans* are left in the possession of all their privileges, except those their sedition have deprived them of.

Surely, Sir, you must know things better, than to be in earnest in what you say. The sedition complained of in parliament, and which have occasioned these acts of parliament against *Boston*, was the sinking of some tea there. Now, Sir, before that, there was several encroachments upon their charter and privileges, which they had been always in possession of; such as the enlarging the power of the courts of Admiralty, by which they were denied the trial of their property by jury; and several taxes imposed upon them without their consent. And to this day there never has been any proof that the people of *Boston* sunk that tea; and though they applied to parliament to be heard by their council, to shew that the tea was not sunk by them, yet they were refused to be heard. Now, Sir, I

have

have always thought it a juſt maxim, that every man is to be ſuppoſed innocent 'till he is found guilty, upon a fair trial, where he has acceſs to defend himſelf. I deſire any man would ſhew me the difference between what happened at *Boſton* by a mob, with regard to the tea, and what has often happened at *London*, where mobs have broke glaſs windows, and done other hurts to property—and would you think it juſt, upon account of ſuch a mob, to deprive the people of *London* of trade, block up their port, and deprive them even of the common neceſſaries of life?

But pray, Sir, what ſedition has the people of *Canada* been guilty of, to provoke the miniſtry to deprive them of what they were entitled to by their capitulation, and afterwards by the king's proclamation, to have the benefit of the laws of *England*? And yet by the late act of parliament, they are reduced to the ſtate of abject ſlavery, denied the privilege of *Engliſh* ſubjects, and their whole property put into the hands of men named by the miniſtry, and turned out by them at pleaſure. When we ſee the miniſtry treat that favourite province ſo, poſſeſſed by

French

French Papiſts, and enlarged on purpoſe to be a power to ſcourge the reſt of *America*, ſurely we cannot expect that they have not the ſame intentions to overturn the liberties of all the reſt of *America*.

16. You ſay the *Americans*, by leaving *Britain*, have quitted the right of voting; and what they have voluntarily quitted they have no right to claim. I never heard that any *American* claimed the right of voting in any election in *England*, by virtue of any poſſeſſions they have in *America*; all they claim is the privileges in their own country, granted them by their charters, and homologated by parliaments, and which they have been in poſſeſſion of for 200 years.

17. You ſay there was no occaſion to hear the *Boſtonians* in their juſtification, as the fact was notorious, and known to thoſe who were the judges.

This is the firſt time I ever heard it advanced, that either an individual, or a town, could be condemned in any free country without being heard. Under an arbitary government this may

be the caſe, becauſe there the will of the ſovereign power is the rule, whether a perſon is innocent or guilty. As to the people of *Boſton* being guilty to the knowledge of their judges, that does not alter the caſe; for if you look into any of the law books of any civilized nation, you'll find, although a judge ſaw a perſon commit a crime, he could not condemn him without a proof. In this caſe, the knowledge of the judges was founded on letters from two governors, which has ſince appeared. By the diſcovery made from their letters theſe governors were a diſgrace to their employments; for inſtead of acting the part of friends to the people intruſted to their care, they made it their buſineſs to make the miniſtry their enemies, frequently by advancing falſehoods.

18. You ſay the power granted to the courts of Admiralty, if a grievance, is no new grievance—it has ſubſiſted for ſome years.

It is true, that this grievance, as well as other grievances and encroachments on the charters of *America*, have ſubſiſted for ſeveral years, but not under different miniſters; for if the common opinion

opinion of mankind be true, we have had only one miniſter ſince his majeſty came to the throne, though he has employed different people under him. And if the people in *America* have bore encroachments on their privileges for ſome years paſt, that can be no reaſon for continuing and encreaſing theſe encroachments; eſpecially when theſe encroachments have ſtruck at the very vitals of the conſtitution, by denying them the uſe of juries, by which their properties were at the abſolute diſpoſal of a judge named by the miniſter, and who he could turn out at pleaſure.

19. You ſay, how ſlavery can be brought from *America* here, none but the *Americans* can ſee.

Here you pretend blindneſs to a thing obvious to every body; for if *America* is reduced to ſlavery, it muſt be done by a very powerful army; for 6 or 700,000 men who have arms, and know the uſe of them, won't tamely ſubmit to ſlavery: and if that army ſhould ſucceed, the ſame ſhips that tranſported them to *America* may as eaſily bring them back when their buſineſs is done, in order to compleat the ſcheme for arbitrary power through all his majeſty's dominions: for the ene-

mies

mies to the preſent miniſtry believe, that the chief view of the preſent meaſures againſt *America*, is to have a pretence to encreaſe the army very conſiderably, which is neceſſary to compleat the ſcheme for arbitrary power in *Britain* and *Ireland*. At preſent the army amounts to upwards of 30,000 men, which is more then King *James* had before the Revolution, by which probably he had eſtabliſhed popery and ſlavery, had not King *William* come to our relief. If we had as many more regular forces as are nedeſſary to execute our preſent ſchemes in *America*, do you think our preſent happy conſtitution is ſafe; beſides the danger we run by the encreaſe of the ſtanding army? Should the miniſtry ſucceed in impoſing taxes on *America* at pleaſure, the fund of corruption muſt be ſo much encreaſed, that there ſhould be little hopes left for preſerving our preſent happy conſtitution.

20. You ſay, that when the legiſlative power is attacked, there nothing remains but either to cruſh the ſpirit of rebellion, or to give up that power.

I anſwer

I anſwer this by another poſition, that if the legiſlative power, appointed by a free people, ſhould at any time encroach upon the privileges and liberties of that people, they have no other remedy, but to take care of their privileges and liberties themſelves, when thoſe they have appointed to take care of them act contrary to their duties. And as to our preſent ſituation with *America*, if the legiſlative power ſhall (and which I hope may be the caſe ſome time or other) find that the miniſtry have followed wrong meaſures, they will correct theſe meaſures, and change theſe miniſters, rather than force a free people to defend their liberties by force.

21. Next you ſay, there are people here who juſtify meaſures taken by the *Americans* againſt the trade of their mother country, which is unknown in hiſtory.

There are hundreds of examples in hiſtory where a free people have been forced to ſhew a ſeeming diſregard to their mother country, by the oppreſſion of thoſe in the legiſlative power. One example of it you have in the people of *Rome* when free and oppreſſed by the ſenate, they

they frequently made a *Seceſſio* to *Mount Sacer*, and refuſed to enliſt themſelves againſt the enemies of *Rome*, 'till their grievances were redreſſed. What the *Americans* have done in the general congreſs, ſeems what they were forced to by neceſſity: they found the miniſtry had no regard to their charters and privileges, they therefore ſhewed, by the reſolutions of that congreſs, that by oppreſſing *America* they muſt ruin the trade of *England*, beggar its manufactures, and by leſſening the number of their ſailors, expoſe themſelves to deſtruction from *France*, the unalterable and only dangerous enemy to *Great Britain*. What they foreſaw is come to paſs; for by the addreſſes from almoſt all the trading places in *England*, the truth of this appears: and if the miniſtry are ſo keen for ruining the liberties of *America*, as to chuſe, rather than not do it, to riſk the ruin of *Great Britain*, whether are they or the *Americans* to blame?

22. You ſay, the people of *Cornwal* have the ſame right to talk the language that the Congreſs at *Philadelphia* do, as being the firſt poſſeſſors of land in *England*

This

This argument of yours is not an argument in favour of what you intend, it is only in favour of the Indians in *America*, who were the firſt poſſeſſors of the lands there: but if the people of *Cornwal* could juſtly ſay, that the reſt of *England* broke through the original compact with them, by which they had agreed to be part of the kngdom of *England*, no doubt they had a right to declare themſelves free of that agreement, by which they conſented to be part of *England*. But I ſubmit it to your cool judgment, whether the people of *Cornwal* have ever complaind, that the reſt of *England* have taken any privilege from them, which they had given them, and which they were in poſſeſſion of for 200 years paſt, and which had been confirmed to them ſeveral times during that time: this ought to be your argument if you intended to make that ſuppoſed caſe of *Cornwal* the ſame with that of *America*.

23. You ſay the friends of the *Americans* threaten us to be attacked by the *Americans* in our turn; therefore, ſays the author, we muſt double our troops and militia.

I never

I never heard any friend of *America* mention what you ſay as poſſible; nor need they take any other method to ruin us but to deprive us of their trade and aſſiſtance. We have loſt the advantages we had by the trade of *Portugal*; by which we had a balance in our favour of a million yearly. Our trade to *Turky* is dwindled to a tenth of what it was: and if we loſe the trade of *America*, our *Weſt India* trade muſt dwindle of courſe, as the *Weſt Indies* are ſupplied with neceſſaries from *North America*. So that if theſe *American* ſchemes ſhould go forward, I ſhould not be ſurpriſed, old as I am, to ſee *Great Britain* a province to *France*. In this place you ſeem to hint at what many ſenſible people here imagine to be the real intention of the miniſtry, to double our military force, under pretence of ſending an army to *America*; and it's eaſy to bring them back to extinguiſh liberty here, after they have done it in *America*. If this is the caſe, you have publiſhed the ſecret intentions of your employers too ſoon.

24. You ſay the friends here of *America*, not only refuſe our parliament the power to tax them, but tell us, that none of our laws can bind them.

You

You repeat here what you have ſaid before, and I refer you to my anſwer to it, which in ſubſtance was, that no friend here of *America*, as far as I know, ever maintained that they were not ſubject to any of our laws; and their practice ſhews they willingly ſubmit to us the regulation of their commerce by the act of navigation.

25. You ſay the laſt war was begun by the *American* outcries, and carried on for their defence, and none but themſelves were gainers by it.

Of all your extraordinary poſitions, this is the moſt extraordinary. All the miniſters, till thoſe of the preſent reign, eaſily foreſaw, that by *America* being properly ſupported againſt the encroachments of *France*, we muſt become the greateſt nation in *Europe*; as by that we muſt be ſupplied with all naval ſtores from thence, and many other things, which coſt this nation ſome millions yearly to foreign nations; and that their demand for our manufactures muſt increaſe every year, as it is computed their numbers double every twenty years; ſo that, in about

eighty years, there will be more people in *Britiſh North America*, than there is in *France*, *Germany*, and *Britain*, which muſt increaſe the number of our manufacturers at home, and our riches, and the number of our ſailors. Whereas had we allowed *France* to build forts on the *Ohio* and the lakes on the back of our ſettlements, the *French* would then have been able to reap all the advantages we now may enjoy from *America*, and conſequently be enabled to preſcribe laws to *Great Britain*. But ſo blind many now in power are, to the glory and intereſt of *Britain*, that I have heard ſome of them ſay, it had been better to have indulged *France* in building theſe forts on the back of our plantations, rather than to allow our brethren in *America* to enjoy their privileges, by which alone they can be a great people, or enable us to be great.——As to your obſervation, that we were no profiters by the war—pray were the *Americans* to blame for that, that after they had aſſiſted us to deſtroy the power of *France* there, and to put us in poſſeſſion of all their ſugar iſlands, by which, with the ſole poſſeſſion of the fiſhery of *Newfoundland*, and of the *Havannah*, we commanded the trade of *France* and *Spain*, and increaſed

creaſed the profits by trade to the extent of four or five millions a year, and increaſed the number of our ſailors, by adding at leaſt 20,000 to their number? I ſay, was that the fault of the *Americans*, that we gave up all theſe advantages, by a ſhameful peace after that ſucceſsful war, which coſt this nation upwards of eighty millions of money, and the lives of more than 200,000 of our braveſt men? By which peace, we received no other advantages but being freed of a *German* war for the defence of *Hanover*, in which we had no concern, and which coſt us upwards of thirty millions ſterling. By this peace *France* and *Spain* have recovered their former ſtrength at ſea, after we had entirely ruined their naval power, beyond a poſſibility of their ever recovering it, as we were in poſſeſſion of their trade which ſupported it. And our *American* ſubjects ſupported us in that war beyond their abilities, and ſhewed an unheard of zeal for their mother country.

26. You ſay we are complained of for ſtopping up their ports, deſtroying their trade, fiſheries, &c. whereas they are ruining our trade, and making bankrupts of our merchants.

This

This is a very merry obſervation of yours: we firſt block up their ports, ruin their trade, and then endeavour to ſtarve them, by denying them the privilege of ſupplying themſelves with fiſh, the great ſupport of the inhabitants there: and becauſe they reſent this unnatural uſage, and ſhew us that our trade muſt ſuffer by our endeavouring to ruin them, therefore we complain againſt them. This puts me in mind of a man, who, after breaking his neighbour's head, and wounding him in ſeveral parts of his body, in the ſevereſt manner, purſued him for ſtriking his hand which held the ſtick that thus wounded him.

27. You ſay, that by thus reſtoring to *France* what we conquered from them, might bring them to the ſenſe of what they owe us.

This propoſal of yours is no more than what I have heard mentioned by ſeveral of the ſycophants of the miniſtry. And I have no doubt, that had the propoſal come before the laſt houſe of commons, from the Treaſury, it would have ſucceeded, even after the bounds of *Canada* had been enlarged: but I hope the preſent houſe of commons would abhor ſuch a propoſal. It is all

we

we got by the laſt ſucceſsful war, having given up to our enemies all the reſt of our valuable conqueſts. To propoſe to any *Britiſh* ſubject to ſurround our Proteſtant brethren by *French* Papiſts, and by a *French* government, muſt be abhorred by every *Britiſh* miniſter, who does not renounce all feelings for his mother country. I have ſeen ſo many things of late ſupported by a *Britiſh* miniſtry, which I ſhould have thought took its riſe from the court of *France*, that if the *French* ſhould threaten to invade *Hanover*, except we agree to ſuch a propoſal, I ſhould not be ſurpriſed if a miniſter was found wicked enough to go into it.

28. You ſay the people here, who encouraged the *Americans* by reſcinding the ſtamp act, are only to blame for all bad conſequences that may happen; for the *Americans* would not have oppoſed it in the way they do now.

It muſt be for ever to the honour of the Marquis of *Rockingham* the reſcinding of the ſtamp act, which at once removed all jealouſies from the minds of the *Americans*, of there being any more encroachments intended againſt them, for there

there were ſeveral more encroachments before. And altho' the *Americans* might not complain ſo loudly as they do now when their whole privileges are attacked, yet that is no argument in favour of that tax: for tho' I ſhould not complain ſo loudly of a man who deprived me of a guinea, as I would of a man who deprived me of my whole ſubſtance, yet you muſt not infer from that, that I ſhould be inſenſible of being deprived unjuſtly of that guinea. And here I muſt obſerve ſomething remarkable on this occaſion: When the ſtamp act paſt in the houſe of commons, Mr. *Grenville* was at the head of the treaſury, and there were only thirty-five members, I think, againſt it——the very next year, the Marquis of *Rockingham* was at the head of the treaſury, and it was repealed by a great majority, by the very ſame houſe of commons.

29. You ſay their charters, being forfeited, may now be modelled at our pleaſure.

This is a new doctrine, unknown in our law books, that a perſon attempting to defend his charter forfeits it. Such a doctrine would make

charters

charters nugatory, and reflect diſhonour on the granters of them, for revoking their own deed without any juſt provocation.

30. You ſeem to laugh at ſuppoſing it in the power of the *Americans* to defend themſelves againſt the power ſent againſt them by *Great Britain.*

Suppoſe another man ſhould laugh at you for laughing at what you laugh at. Which of the two laughs do you think a reaſonable man would think beſt founded? It is true, our fleets may ruin their maritime ports, and hurt their trade; but it is not eaſy to conquer 6 or 700,000 men, with arms in their hands, and who know the uſe of them, when they believe they are fighting for every thing that is dear to them. By hurting them to the value of a ſhilling, I am afraid we ſhall hurt ourſelves in a crown, when we conſider all the advantages we have reaſon to expect will ariſe from a good correſpondence with our *American* ſettlements.

I have made the foregoing obſervations on the chief arguments contained in your pamphlet. I

can

can eaſily have charity for moſt people who differ from me in opinion, becauſe different opinions moſtly ariſe from different educations; and we are frequently under biaſes without being ſenſible of it. My own education has been under the care of my predeceſſors, who were lovers of liberty, and oppoſed the encroachments on it in the four laſt reigns of the *Stewart* family, and were zealous friends to the Revolution, and the ſettlement on the preſent royal family; and I have ventured my life and fortune in its defence. And my principles with regard to government, are much the ſame with thoſe of Mr. *Locke* in his treatiſe on that ſubject. I think from your Pamphlet, your principles are different from mine—this does not ſurprize me—but I own I am ſurprized to find any man, who is not dependent on the miniſtry, declare it to be our intereſt to go to war with *North America*, which muſt ruin the proſpect we had of being the greateſt nation in *Europe*, and can ſerve no intereſt but that of *France*, our natural enemy; for had they the direction of our meaſures, they could not have dictated any more effectual than thoſe now putting in practice, which muſt end, in my opinion, in the deſtruction of the trade, manufactures, riches, and power of

Great

Great Britain, and by deſtroying our trade, leſſen the number of our ſailors, and ſo leave us a prey to *France*.

In the time when virtue moſt flouriſhed at *Athens*, both virtue and vice were brought on the ſtage, to recommend the one and expoſe the other; introducing people who practiſed either the one or the other. And if *Sophocles* and *Ariſtophanes* were alive, they would probably introduce on the ſtage, thoſe people in power who have puſhed on theſe meaſures againſt *America*.

At that time nobody was afraid of this freedom of the ſtage, but bad men; for if people are ſenſible they intend what is for the publick good, they need not fear calumny, which can never hurt any body long if not well founded.

Afterwards when vice crept in, in the days of *Menander*, who *Julius Cæſar* ſays was the beſt writer for the ſtage, he altered this cuſtom, becauſe there were many who forgot their duty to their country, and could not bear to be expoſed on the ſtage, as their actions could not be juſtified.

What happened in *Greece* much about this time, is ſomething like our preſent ſituation. When virtue flouriſhed, they joined all in oppoſing the power of *Perſia*, as their mortal enemy, and ſupported their colonies in *Aſia Minor*; but when the difference aroſe between *Sparta* and *Athens*, they forgot their common concerns for their country, and by courting the friendſhip of the *Perſian* king, to ſupport their different pretenſions to command *Greece*, they abandoned their colonies to the will of their mortal enemy the king of *Perſia*. Tho' we have not yet abandoned our colonies to *France*, yet we are endeavouring to deſtroy their liberties, and make them uſeleſs to themſelves or us, by which we weaken ourſelves as much as the *Greeks* did by abandoning and giving up their colonies in *Aſia*.

I hope the preſent parliament will ſee reaſon to alter what was done by the laſt; and it never can be a reflection upon any man or miniſter to alter his meaſures, if he thinks them deſtructive to his country; for it is no more than ſaying, he is wiſer to-day than he was yeſterday. And I own I tremble at the thoughts of what we are expoſed to, by the danger we run into from *France*, by exporting

exporting to America our force both by ſea and land, which alone can ſecure us againſt the ambitious views of that nation.

To conclude: our preſent ſituation with regard to our brethren in *America*, muſt give the moſt diſmal apprehenſions to every body who really has the public intereſt at heart—to ſee the nation throw out about 90 millions of money, and the lives of ſome hundred thouſands of their beſt ſubjects, in order to ſecure our valuable dominions in *America*, againſt the encroachments of *France*, by driving the *French* out of *North America*; without which our ſettlements there could not be ſecure: and after we had thus ſecured ourſelves in the poſſeſſion of all that large continent, to ſee us wantonly throwing away all the advantages ariſing to our country, by the poſſeſſion of one of the greateſt empires in the world; by means of which we would be able to furniſh ourſelves with naval ſtores, and other neceſſaries, in exchange for our manufactures, which coſt us ſome millions a year to foreign nations: I ſay, to ſee us wantonly throw away theſe advantages, by which our trade, our fleet, and manufacturers are ſupported, and endeavouring to deſtroy our brethren upon that con-

continent, becauſe they don't chuſe to part with their liberties and privileges, and be ſlaves to our miniſtry here, is ſomething that appears ſo ridiculous in the opinion of moſt ſenſible men I converſe with, except penſioners and placemen, and their connections, that one could not believe it to have happened, except we had ſeen it; as by what we have done with regard to *America*, we have done the very thing *France* wiſhes us to do; and which, if perſiſted in, muſt end in our ruin, and probably in our being a province to *France*.

Our ſituation with regard to *France* is very like that of the free ſtates of *Greece*, and particularly of *Athens*, with regard to *Philip* King of *Macedon*. When he ſchemed the conqueſt of *Greece*, he pretended to be their beſt friend, and by bribery got himſelf elected a member of the *Amphictyons*, the court which had the care of the affairs of *Greece*: and when the people of *Phocis* were guilty of what they called ſacrilege againſt the groves belonging to the oracle at *Delphos*, he offered his ſervice againſt thoſe people. At the ſame time he attacked the principal frontier of *Athens*, on the borders of *Greece*:

and

and when theſe Allies complained to *Athens*, their orators, who were all bribed by him, except *Demoſthenes*, threw delays in the way to prevent the Athenians from ſuccouring their allies, till it was too late. The town of their Allies was taken, and the inhabitants ſold for ſlaves. On pretence of puniſhing the people of *Phocis* for their ſacrilege, he took poſſeſſion of the paſs of *Thermopylæ*, and ſo enter'd *Greece* with his whole army; and, by the battle of *Chæronea*, enſlaved that people, the braveſt that ever appeared on earth. Before he diſcovered his real intentions, he took every method to promote luxury and diſſipation amongſt the youth of *Greece*—particularly at *Athens* there was a club of 60 or 70 of the firſt families there, who gave themſelves entirely up to pleaſure, and neglect of the affairs of the publick. To theſe he applied himſelf in a particular manner; commending them for their fine taſte of life, he deſired to be a member of their club, and ſent them very rich preſents. By ſuch methods, and many fair profeſſions of friendſhip to the ſtate of *Athens*, he cajoled them into ſlavery.

Is not our caſe with *France*, much the ſame with that of the free ſtates of *Greece*, with regard

to

to the King of *Macedon?* and does any man of ſenſe, who is not bribed to think otherwiſe, believe that the intentions of *France* can ever be to ſerve the intereſt of *Great Britain?* They are our natural enemies, and they never will forgive us for being the only power in *Europe* which put a ſtop to their project of univerſal monarchy. Our ſaving them from ruin by the laſt ignominious peace, will have no other effect but to encourage them to compleat our ruin whenever they can; and ſurely they never can have a better opportunity, than when our fleet and army is employed to ruin our ſettlements in *America*, when our trade and manufactures are ruined, and we want ſailors to man our fleet; and when there is univerſal diſcontent, not only in *America*, but in *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, by the deſtruction of trade and manufactures.

There is a report prevails, as if *France* inſiſted to have back *Canada*, with all the additions made to it by our miniſtry: by which they would have the pleaſure to encompaſs the ſettlements of our Proteſtant brethren, and ſo deſtroy them whenever they have an opportunity. It is ſcarce poſſible, that even the *French* could have

the

the aſſurance to make this propoſal, as this is all we got by the laſt ſucceſsful war, and for reſtoring *France* and *Spain* to what we had taken from them, by which we may be ſaid to have been in poſſeſſion of the trade of *America*. But after what I have ſeen, particularly the attempt at once to ruin the liberties of *Britain*, by making general warrants legal; by the houſe of Commons impriſoning my Lord Mayor for maintaining the liberties of the city, eſtabliſhed by act of parliament; after ſeeing Popery and ſlavery eſtabliſhed in *Canada*, and Popiſh counſellors, judges, and juſtices of peace, eſtabliſhed in the *Grenades*, contrary to the intention of the act of ſettlement in the crown by King *William*—nothing can ſurpriſe me. And if we ſhould give back *Canada* to *France*, perhaps *Jerſey*, *Guernſey*, and the *Iſle* of *Wight*, might follow, if *France* threaten to invade *Hanover*, if we refuſe them that compliment. But to free ourſelves for ever from any dependence on *France*, we have only two things to do: Firſt, to renew our alliance with the emperor. Secondly, if his Majeſty can be perſuaded to give *Hanover* to one of the branches of his family, not poſſeſſed of the crown of *Britain*. This would not only free us from all

dependence

dependence on *France*, but likewiſe make his Majeſty adored by his *Britiſh* ſubjects, and free *Hanover* from invaſions from *France*. And as the feudal law, and the law of nations, have been my ſtudy, I ſhall be able to ſhew that this may be done agreeable to theſe laws and the practice of the *Empire*.

This will ſecure us againſt the only enemy abroad we have to fear. But our danger from ourſelves is the greateſt of all dangers; for if we don't get the better of our luxury, venality, diſſipation, and want of publick ſpirit, we muſt be ruined in the ſame way that all the free ſtates which have exiſted before us have been.

I have been acquainted with all ranks of men for more than ſixty years, and have always found two poſitions approved of univerſally. 1. That it would be for the intereſt of *Britain* and *Hanover*, to have different ſovereigns. 2. That, by encouraging *America*, we muſt be a great nation. But I find now that our miniſters maintain a quite different ſyſtem; but are ſupported in it by no body but penſioners and placemen, except thoſe who don't underſtand the intereſt of *Great Britain*.

I am, &c.

16. Vertot's hiſtory of the Knights of Malta, 5 vols. 15s.
17. Memoirs of an Eaſt India Gentleman. 3s.
18. Memoirs of the Duke of Sully, prime Miniſter to Henry IV. of France, 5 vols. 15s.
19. Monteſquieu's Spirit of Laws, 2 vols. 6s.
20. The Fable of the Bees, by Mandeville, 2 vols. 6s.
21. The World, a new edition, with the mottoes tranſlated, 4 vols. 10s.
22. Pope's works complete, with all his notes, 6 vols. 14s.
23. Pope's Eſſays, Epiſtles, and Odes, ſeparate. 3s.
24. —— Homer's Iliad and Odyſſey, 2 vols. 7s. 6d.
25. Voltaire's hiſtory of Charles XII. of Sweden, 2s. 6d.
26. Paracleſis; or, Conſolations deduced from natural and revealed Religion. In two Diſſertations. The firſt ſuppoſed to have been compoſed by Cicero; now rendered into Engliſh: The laſt originally written by Thomas Blacklock, D. D. 5s.
27. Burkitt's Expoſition of the New Teſtament. 1l. 1s.
28. Boſton's illuſtration of the Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion; or, A complete body of Divinity, 3 vols. 8vo. 15s.
29. Edwards on religious affections. 5s.
30. Shenſtone's poetical works. 3s.
31. Strictures on military dicipline, by an Officer. 4s.
32. Cruſoe's adventures, with cuts. 2s. 6d.
33. Oeconomy of Human Life, both parts. 1s.
34. Prideaux's Connections, 4 vols. 12s.
35. Plutarch's Lives, 6 vols. 18s.
36. Rowe's Letters. 2s. 6d.
37. Juſtice's Britiſh Gardener's Director. 5s.
38. Reid's Scots Gardener. 2s. 6d.
39. Shakeſpeare's works, 12 vols. 1l. 4s.
40. Spectator, 8 vols. 16s.
41. Telemachus, from the French, 2 vols. the beſt tranſlation. 5s.
42. Le Avventure di Telemaco, riveduta e corretta da Pietro Nicoloſi. 3s.
43. Pieces choiſies de Moliere. A l'uſage des ecoles. 3s.
44. Dr. Baillie's Letter to Dr Shebbeare, containing a refutation of his arguments concerning the Boſton and Quebec acts of parliament, and his aſperſions upon the memory of K. William, and the Proteſtant Diſſenters. 2s.

Liſts of JOHN DONALDSON's other Books are given to ſuch as pleaſe to call, or ſend for them, to the Corner of *Arundel-Street*, in the *Strand*; where he has now a greater Collection of uſeful and entertaining Books than he ever had before.

N. B. He has no Concern in any other Shop

BOOKS printed for, and ſold by

JOHN DONALDSON,

Corner of *Arundel-Street*, in the STRAND.

1. ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA: or, A Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, compiled upon a new Plan, and illuſtrated with 160 Copper-plates. By a Society of Gentlemen in *Scotland*, 3 vols. 4to. Price 3l. 3s.—This is the lateſt-publiſhed Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, and contains many articles not to be found in any other.

2. Poſtlethwayt's Univerſal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce, with large additions and improvements, adapting the ſame to the preſent State of Britiſh Affairs, with every thing eſſential in Savary's Dictionary, 4th edit. 1774. 2 large vols. folio. 4l. 10s.

3. Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of *Scotland*; containing an hiſtorical and genealogical account of the Nobility of that Kingdom, from their origin to the preſent generation, with the arms. 1l. 16s.

4. Forduni Scotichronicon, cum ſupplementis et continuatione Walteri Boweri; præfixa eſt ad hiſtoriam Scotorum introductio brevis, cura Walteri Goodall, 2 vols. folio. 2l. 12s. 6d.

5. An Eſſay on the Art of War, tranſlated from the French of Count Turpin, by Capt. Joſeph Otway, 2 vols. 4to. 1l. 5s.

6. Hiſtory of the Roman Emperors, from Auguſtus to Conſtantine, by Mr. Crevier, 10 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

7. Memoirs of the Marchioneſs of Pompadour, written by herſelf; wherein are diſplay'd the motives of the wars, treaties of Peace, embaſſies, and negotiations in the ſeveral Courts of Europe, 2 vols. 12mo. 6s.

8. Familiar Letters on various ſubjects of Buſineſs and Amuſement, by Charles Hallifax. 3s.

9. The Family-Expoſitor; or, A Paraphraſe and Verſion of the New Teſtament, with critical notes, and a practical improvement of each ſection, by P. Doddridge, D. D. 6 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

10. Rouſſeau's whole works, 10 vols. 12mo. 1l. 10s.

11. Stackhouſe's hiſtory of the Bible, 6 vols. 8vo. 1l. 7s.

12. The whole works of Mr. James Hervey, late Rector of Weſton-Favell, 6 vols. 12mo. 18s.

13. Hervey's Meditations and Contemplations. 3s.

14. Dr. Young's whole works, 3 vols. 9s.

15. Biſhop Burnet's hiſtory of his own times, 6 vols. 15s.